

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/007,375	Applicant(s) SNOWDEN ET AL.
	Examiner Katherine A. Bareford	Art Unit 1762

All Participants:**Status of Application:** after final(1) Katherine A. Bareford. (3) _____.(2) Mr. Herrick. (4) _____.**Date of Interview:** 24 November 2003**Time:** _____**Type of Interview:**

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.**Rejection(s) discussed:***outstanding 35 USC 112 rejection as to the use of the term "minimal"***Claims discussed:**

12

Prior art documents discussed:*none***Part II.****SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:***See Continuation Sheet***Part III.**

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examinee/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Mr. Herrick agreed to an Examiner's Amendment to amend claim 12, line 2, to change "minimal" to less and add "and providing an antistatic rich surface" after "gsm" in the last line to put the case in condition for allowance. Mr. Herrick also agreed to an Examiner's Amendment to claim 12, line 4 to correct the spelling of "barri r" to "barrier" to put the case in condition for allowance..